

MINUTES

Nevada Children’s Justice Act (CJA) Task Force Subcommittee
Evaluation of Grantees

November 9, 2022

10:00 AM

1. Call to Order – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Salli Kerr noted that Janice Wolfe, spokesperson for the subcommittee, could not be present. Dylan Nall said Master Michelle Rodriguez was willing to run the meeting. Both Salli Kerr and Master Rodriguez were having audio problems, so Dylan Nall called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

2. For information: Roll Call – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall called the roll.

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Betsey Crumrine	Nevada DCFS
Desiree Mattice	Sergeant – Dept. of Public Safety
Dylan Nall	Nevada DCFS
Fran Maldonado	Nevada DCFS
Michelle Rodriguez	Family Court Master
Salli Kerr	Western Regional CAC
Bruce Cole (recorder)	Nevada DCFS

Absent:

Name	Organization
Jane Saint	Director, Nevada CASA
Janice Wolfe	Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

3. Initial Public Comment (Discussion only: Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled for action at a later meeting) – Salli Kerr, Chair

No comments.

4. For Information: Review CJA Evaluation process – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall said the purpose of the subcommittee is to oversee the effectiveness of the of the CJA grantees and to monitor their activities to meet the CJA task for goals and then help develop an evaluation process to help write the annual CJA report, which must be submitted to the Children's Bureau at the end of May each following year.

Betsey Crumrine said she understood the purpose of the Subcommittee in the past has been to review applications and vote on the projects that the committee wants to fund. But this

subcommittee is a new subcommittee, and she wasn't entirely clear on what we were going to be doing. She was not sure that a subcommittee is needed to develop an evaluation process. She thought that's a function of the FPO people. Grants Management Unit in the past has always monitored the grants

Salli Kerr said she thought that Dylan had sent some specific evaluations like the one from the training on sexual assaults. They evaluated the number of people that went through the training, and that think they were going to do their job better because of the training and whatever those questions were in the evaluation that would be contained in that, and that this subcommittee would be talking about maybe even adopting something like that as the evaluation we would have each grantee provide to us. Or is that outside of the scope of what we're talking about here? Desiree Mattice thought that when we had had our previous meetings and we were talking about this, we had some questions about the way that they were providing us information. So, we were talking about creating or developing this evaluation process? Then, when we had our questions that we were able to get the response that we were looking for rather than us guessing what they were trying to provide. This was to guide us to understand exactly what they were requesting and how we were going to evaluate what they were requesting. For example, for the training, how do we evaluate that, when they conducted this training, that it assisted them in a progression of their positions as opposed to just oh, they attended and got a certificate.

Salli Kerr asked, does the Children's Bureau have specific requests that we're required to ask when we do an evaluation. Is one of them: does what I learned provide additional skills for the job that I'm doing, or something like that? Does the Children's Bureau have a recommended set of questions, or something that they're going to track that we need to match our evaluation process?

Dylan Nall talked about what the Children's Bureau had said, as laid out in the CJA meeting in October. Their items for consideration in the annual report are that narratives include references to evaluation outputs and outcomes. There was a lack of clear and specific data provided in these areas. In future reports the Children's Bureau would like to see more detailed information such as results of surveys, and post- and pre-tests related to trainings to the extent possible, such as information as the type of training provided to whom, and the number or percentages of targeted population of who was trained that received the training. Our evaluation as FPO, is that in our CJA annual report we're not giving them enough evaluation methods, outputs, and incomes. They just want us to be more detailed. So, with that information, to help with the Children's Bureau and their needs, when we have these grantees, we're able to then find a method to get them to give us a little bit more information to evaluate their program better, which then would give us more information for us to submit our annual report.

Dylan Nall said Judy Henderson, of the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic Violence, has an evaluation process with pre- and post-tests and then it has what everyone's scored on it. It is great how she was able to evaluate her program with this. She didn't provide it back Dylan, so at the next meeting Dylan can post that in as an attachment and then everyone can review it.

Salli Kerr said her other question would be if we have a really good evaluation process for training, that's one thing, but there have been other times when we have funded things like equipment for

frontline workers, what kind of evaluation process is the Children's Bureau looking at for those kinds of expenditures? Dylan gave the example of when we funded laptops last year. There was a poll which talks about how many times they use their laptops in the field and what kind of information that they were able to get. Did it help them make safety decisions like the Children's Bureau really wants? How has this impacted the frontline investigation process? How has this made the rural region or Clark or Washoe better CPS workers?

Betsey Crumrine asked about language in the document Dylan attached in her e-mail. It talks about subrecipient monitoring and performance reports. What is GMU/s role in monitoring these grants, because that is their job and so is GMU doing the sub recipient monitoring and getting the performance reports and what are we doing different than that or has GMU decided they're not going to monitor grants anymore? Dylan Nall replied that she receives every month a quick synopsis of what is being done by the grantees. The written report is quarterly; basically, every time we meet as the CJA task force she sends an e-mail out to each grantee and says it's time again, can you please send me your grantee updates? It's a quick paragraph basically of how much money they spent and what they spent their money on. Sometimes they don't have any updates and that's OK. By giving us those quarterly reports, it lets FPO, and Dylan and Beverly Brown make sure that they are still are doing what they're supposed to be doing. So that is what the performance reports are, and then she distributes them out every quarter to CJA. Salli Kerr said it sounds like Dylan and Beverly are doing what GMU used to do. Dylan said she is not sure what GMU gets from the grantees. She knows they receive an annual report. She can reach out to GMU and find out. The grantees are giving us quarterly updates of what they're doing and how they're spending the money.

Betsey Crumrine commented that the "purpose" of this subcommittee is to do further evaluation on whether we think that they are achieving their goals by doing the activities that they're doing. It feels like a lot of micromanaging to her. Dylan replied that performance reports are a little bit different than evaluations. Evaluations would be the entire project, making sure that it's impacting, and the grantees are doing what they're supposed to be doing. Performance reports are what they're currently doing in that quarter. It could be looking like a lot of micromanaging, but if we were able to get a solid evaluation process for the grant done, it's just going to be quick: like, let's get this process figured out. Then we can get the evaluation done and then write better reports for the Children's Bureau.

Desiree said she could hear both sides and see where there's confusion, especially in the micromanaged side. One of the things that hit her was when we were doing the grant process and there was a lot of training requests that were coming through. And the numbers seemed a little bit odd, like one or two people attending some specific training. But there wasn't a lot of detail of what this training was going to provide other than what the title of it was. There was some question on how do we evaluate that? She sees where we need to be getting a response back telling us: this training, this is what it did, this is how we progressed in our program, and this is how it became beneficial as opposed to just sending X amount of people to this training just to say that they've had it underneath their belt.

Desiree Mattice continued that as for monitoring, they provide in their request for those grant funds that they're going to complete X things within a certain time and following up to see if it was beneficial at that time. If it's not, are they going to be able to complete that thing? For instance, purchasing. As we know with everything that's happened in the world with COVID and stuff, every production has kind of slowed down. So, if they're requesting computers, were they even able to get those computers? Are they not able to get those computers? Maybe it's a time frame issue with the production side of things. By the time the grant ends, if they're unable to use those funds, we can understand what's going on.

Betsey Crumrine said she did not have answers to her questions. She was not in agreement with this group helping write the report to Children's Bureau. She didn't think that part of what she agreed to do when she joined this subcommittee was to do that evaluation piece.

Dylan Nall answered that the subcommittee is not going to help write the report. That is her and Beverly's job. What the evaluation process does is help them write it. So, if we have a good strong evaluation record and, say, GBC is saying they funded this and did that XYZ, that helps them write it, which in turn then if they have a strong evaluation for GBC then the federal government isn't going to come back to the Children's Bureau saying you need to work on your evaluation process like they did the last two years.

**5. For Information: To review this year's grantees and their proposed evaluation methods –
Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Because the evaluation tool used by the Coalition to End Domestic Violence has not been sent to Dylan by Judy Henderson, the meeting moved on to Item 6.

**6. For Possible Action: To review and possibly make edits to SFY 2024 NOFO application –
Dylan Nall, DCFS**

Desiree Mattice asked if, based on our conversation, we were talking about potential usage of other recipients and how they do their evaluation process. Do we want to stand by to maybe provide some alteration on the performance report section of our NOFO?

Beverly Brown said that we must put this out in January. She doesn't believe that there's more time to meet to edit this at a future point. She added that she wasn't here for the first part of the meeting, but at a different meeting. She said the performance part that comes out of our Grants Management Unit serves a little bit of a different purpose than our evaluation one. We did put that in there because we were really having trouble just getting updates in general from grantees a couple of years ago. So that was added by Grants Management to try and just hold them more accountable to getting us those updates to show how much money they're spending. That's a little bit different than the evaluation piece. She didn't know that there's a need to edit that because that would really need to be looked at by our Grants Management team. Beverly said she still has applications coming in that are just about giving people certificates, saying 18 people attended this training and that's what we're doing for our evaluation and outcomes. So, the question is: is there anything that we can do in this evaluation part that would eliminate that. If we bring it here and see if anyone has any ideas or any way, we can shore up the language a little better to make it stronger so that we can avoid that from happening again this next year, that would be ideal.

Betsey Crumrine said we accept, though, if they say they're going to give us a certificate documenting that 18 people attended if they put that in their application. We maybe need to say that that's not an acceptable form of evaluation. In addition to telling us how many people attended, we want the people to fill out a five-question survey about what they reckon was the best take away from the conference that they went to. Would they recommend this in future years for other people to attend? We need to say that's what we want in the application. Desiree Mattice said that forensic interview training is just one of those examples where there are a lot of aspects that go into it, not just attending the class and getting your certificate, but that increases the assistance for specific cases where kids only can be interviewed by somebody who is forensically trained. So, by having those goals this increased our interview process; we've been able to service, say, 15 kids as opposed to five. Having those concrete statistical numbers maybe would be more beneficial rather than they attended this class and got their certificate because as we know there are courses that we do attend, but it doesn't necessarily provide additional progress with our current work as much as more of an understanding where this would provide additional assistance in making it so more children can relate to as opposed to not. If there's a way that we can make that evaluation, it's like we were saying for maybe next year that would be great.

Salli Kerr said that training came to her mind as well. We could also look at the training providers that are going to come and that already have well established evaluation processes in place. We can say, if you're working with a provider that you're paying \$12,000 to bring training, we're going to want to see their evaluation results. That's why we got such great results from the coalition to end sexual violence. She did a great job on the evaluation process and would provide that to us even if they're the ones that created the training. They are delivering this and here's what the evaluation of that is as part of the training. To Desiree Mattice's point, you can literally look at the outcome of number of kids served if you're bringing additional forensic interviewers online that are now providing services that they couldn't before. There might very well be a way to capture some output numbers from that.

Dylan Nall asked Beverly Brown if in the application we could ask, how will this accomplishment directly provide for your staff, or what are your project protections like, or what do you think will come from this training?

Beverly Brown said they do provide some of that already. The issue is more that we need them to provide us with: OK, you did this training, how are you going to know it worked? How are you going to know it was effective? How are you going to know it changed anything?

Desiree Mattice asked if, by putting it in that section, they are saying that this is what it's going to accomplish, we're requesting them to show that it did? And if it didn't accomplish it, explain what it did accomplish outside of what they described, would that be wrong?

Beverly Brown said we should add in there how they not only describe what it's going to accomplish, but how they're going to measure that.

Desiree Mattice asked if there is a way of putting that in for the methods of accomplishment? For example, if they were saying that the skill set was for exit interviewing, or if we saw one of the previous things were some courses that we had not heard about, and we were trying to figure out

that information, like art therapy type stuff, if there's a way that they can provide those accomplishments based on what they described was going to occur.

Salli Kerr reiterated that in this to make mention of the fact that if they're bringing in trainers to use the evaluations that the training providers already have as a part of that process, just to remind them that have a look at who you're paying to provide training and what they already have for evaluation. Betsey Crumrine said that, having written grants CJA grants, having helped agencies get these grants, and then having been on the other side of it, having been a recipient and having to do this stuff, it's a lot of work applying for these and often it's not a whole lot of money. It's 10 grand, it's 20 grand. That's not a whole lot of money. So, utilizing the evaluations that the trainers have is perfectly reasonable. We can't ask them how many more kids will be interviewed because of this training because they don't know. There's no way to get that number. We can ask a question like asking the training recipients how did this training change your way of doing business or how did it increase your skill or whatever -something that is concrete that they can answer but, we don't want to make it so cumbersome that people don't want to apply for the grant because it's not worth the hassle either, and that is sometimes how people feel.

Salli Kerr said she appreciated that point a lot. If what we're going to do is ask the recipients of the training that little three or four questions survey, that's going to be, how did this really impact your ability to do your job? Or would you recommend this training be used again? It's important because who knows? Sometimes you go to these and think, I can't get that 2 1/2 hours back. Part of the process will be that we can provide them with those survey questions, or we can set a survey up or however it is that we collect that. The grantee is going to be responsible to get that from the people that are recipients of the training. But it really can be a three question Microsoft form, it does not have to be anything more. Betsey Crumrine said, for example, that the forensic interview training was hugely impactful for the rural region law enforcement entities. When people graduate, they don't get picked up by Washoe and Clark, they get picked up by a little 2 station police house in rural Nevada and they don't have a lot of training and they are the first responders on the scene and so these guys had no clue how to interview kids. So that training for the Rurals was hugely impactful and especially for that deputy that's brand spanking new. It's impactful because you are a first-year law enforcement officer and never had any experience with kids, this gave you the skills to be able to talk to kids and to know when to stop talking to kids, which is most important.

Dylan Nall said what she was hearing from everybody is keep it short, simple, and sweet. She didn't want to make this anymore difficult because it causes herself more work. She liked what Desiree, Sally, and Betsy had been saying. If you have a trainer and outside evaluation, provide DCFS that evaluation. You would just copy and paste that there, or the same if they provide a post- or pre-test. Then, what do you hope will be accomplished? If I'm sending 72 people to the forensic interview training now, I'm going to say I have 72 more forensic interviewers. Questions can be limited to like 2 sentences or a paragraph. We don't need to add more work for anybody. Salli Kerr said the only thing she would add, and this was to Desiree's earlier point, is some question which might be more in the back end of when we look at this, and you tell us what you hope to accomplish, where do we compare it to what was accomplished? Maybe we ask that in the quarterly report where we'd say, are your accomplishments still on track? Then why did we or didn't we accomplish that? There are a lot of times when outside forces are such that we didn't accomplish that because, for instance, the

whole world just went virtual. We all know there are plenty of ways now that we see impacts where we may not get it accomplished or may need additional resources or something.

Desiree Mattice said that every agency ultimately does their own evaluation process, and she know that from receiving some of the requests and NOFOs from them that there's some that do very good statistical evaluation and they have lots of numbers to provide and then others do more of that quality response just like what Betsy had described. If we give them the option that they can do this either way, that would be beneficial to us because we may get numbers with them and not from others. But either way, if we're able to evaluate and see that what they had requested for and received funding for is being accomplished.

Beverly Brown said language can be added saying, if you're providing a training, you know it's expected that there will be a survey or a pre- and post-test and then they'll be reporting back to the CJA. Just making it simple, like if you're doing training, we need these things. We need to know who was taking the training and this was the feedback we received from the Children's Bureau. We need to know who's taking the training, the intended number of people taking the training, how many people took the training, and then any data or information that comes out of survey or pre- and post- tests. Sometimes there's other activities besides training. The Great Basin Child Advocacy Center, when we started funding them a couple years ago, sent data that showed an increase in the number of forensic interviews they were doing, and that was perfect, an absolute great thing to show that there was this increase in their abilities to do forensic interviews.

Desiree Mattice said sometimes we have received those notifications or requests about attending a conference and the conference has so much information in it that they do have those little courses that are kind of offshoots, and some people attend one where somebody else may attend another. So having that feedback of what was accomplished during that time is beneficial. Dylan Nall said she liked changing the quarterly report, to reflect the progress of what they're funding and things like that. That's an easy fix from the quarterly reports that she fills out. Is there anything else that we want to change for the quarterly report? Salli Kerr said Dylan has managed the quarterly reporting really well, from several years ago when you couldn't get people to ever send it in or show up. Grantees expect now that they need to appear at least a couple times a year and provide reasonable documentation and that has been embedded in the culture on the ground as far as them knowing that they're required to do that. Dylan Nall added that they will be taught to give a verbal update too - just so they know instead of Dylan emailing them all the time. Desiree Mattice asked, if things are not being accomplished, what are your barriers? Are we seeking to see if they have a way to either get around those barriers or to continue to accomplish, do we want that information? It would be pertinent, especially if they say, oh well, it doesn't work anymore, then that would be kind of an end-all. But if they say well it's not available till this time, are they trying to accomplish it by that time?

Salli Kerr suggested something like, what supports do you need to be able to accomplish it? She would love to see the day when they come to the larger CJA committee and they say we have this barrier and because the committee has now said we want to be involved at what they do, spend some time brainstorming with these grantees how to overcome their barriers. We have great expertise in this group. Let's support them when they come and bring the expertise we have. Desiree Mattice had a question about the one-paragraph limit in the document. Was this for just one question or the whole document? Dylan replied that she was fine with a limit of 2 to 4

sentences per question. Desiree Mattice moved to approve the addition of this language into the NOFO and the quarterly reports for the upcoming fiscal year. Salli Kerr seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

7. For Possible Action: To review and add possible future agenda items – Dylan Nall, DCFS

Dylan Nall said she would provide the evaluation template from Judy Henderson and the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic Violence as an agenda item at the February meeting, along with the updated NOFO application.

8. For Information: Announcements – Salli Kerr, Chair

There were no announcements.

9. Final Public Comment (Discussion only: Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled for action at a later meeting) – Janice Wolf, Spokesperson

There were no comments.

10. Adjournment – Salli Kerr, Chair

Meeting adjourned at 11:07 AM.